

HRPP010061762025



Presented on : 11-07-2025  
Registered on : 11-07-2025  
Decided on : 16-07-2025  
Duration : 0 years, 0 months, 5 days

**IN THE COURT OF  
Additional Sessions Judge  
at Panipat  
(Presided Over by Shri Amberdeep Singh)**

**BA/1621/2025**

**Anil** son of Shri Vikram Singh, aged about 41 years, resident of 117,  
Hanuman Colony, near Anand Kiryana Store, Panipat.

...Applicant/accused

Versus

State of Haryana through SHO Police Station Chandnibagh, District  
Panipat.

...Respondent.

FIR No.59 dated 25.1.2025  
Under Section(s): 406 and 420 of IPC  
Police Station: Chandnibagh, Panipat.

**First bail application for bail**

Present: Shri Subhash Shelat, counsel for applicant/accused.  
Shri Baljit Singh, Public Prosecutor for the respondent/State.

**ORDER**

This first bail application is moved on behalf of  
applicant/accused, named above.

2. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that one complaint  
was made by complainant Wasim Khan alleging therein that he was  
knowing the accused Anil Kumar for the last five years as both of them

(Amberdeep Singh)  
ASJ, Panipat, 16.7.2025

**Anil Versus State of Haryana**

were posted in the same bank. The accused used to borrow Rs.20/30,000/- from him and repaid the money back. They were having good relations. The accused was posted as branch Manager of IIFL, Finance Gold Loan Branch, Sanoli Road, Panipat. The accused made a telephonic call to the complainant in the month of March, 2024 and told him that some persons had taken loan against gold from his branch and they had defaulted in repaying the loan and the gold worth Rs.30 to Rs.35 lac could be secured for Rs.20 to Rs.25 lac and the complainant could get good profit by selling the gold and asked him to arrange 20 to 25 lac rupees and he would get it sold on good price. The complainant believed the accused and took loan of Rs.3 lac in the name of his firm against the security of his house from Bank of Baroda and transferred the amount to the account of the accused Anil Kumar. On 10.4.2024, the complainant paid Rs.8 lac to the accused. Accused told the complainant that he had purchased gold worth Rs.11 lac and the complainant had earned profit of Rs.2 lac and paid Rs.2 lac to the complainant on 12.4.2024, by transferring the amount in his bank account. On 15.4.2024, the accused Anil Kumar told the complainant that gold worth Rs.12 lac was to be disbursed and the complainant paid Rs.12 lac in the account of the accused and on 4.5.2024, accused paid Rs.1 lac in the account of the firm of the complainant and told him that he would pay Rs.23 lac with profit to the complainant within 10 days. But when complainant called the accused for payment of Rs.23 lac, the accused and his wife met the complainant at the house of the accused and told him to wait for one more week as they have to sell more gold

**Anil Versus State of Haryana**

by purchasing it and they would also earn some profit. The wife of the complainant also told him that she has also purchased gold after taking money from her friends. They told him that gold worth Rs.50 lac were to be auctioned next week and they were to purchase it before auctioned and asked him to arrange Rs.10 lac but the complainant refused. The accused also told him that if he could not return the money of the complainant he would transfer his house situated in TDI to the complainant and also offered him to take the possession and to execute the agreement but the complainant believed the accused. When complainant after one week made phone call to accused, the accused told him that he had purchased gold with money of the complainant which was not yet sold. The complainant then asked for gold which was purchased with his money but the accused started making excuses. Thereafter, complainant went to meet accused Anil Kumar in his bank and came to know that he had not purchased any gold and cheated him of Rs.23 lac and showed him false profit of the money taken from him and paid Rs.3 lac out of his money. The complainant gave him 10 days time but the accused refused to pay the money after 10 days and also threatened him. The complainant was advised by his acquaintances to take the legal action but the complainant made phone call to the accused but his phone was switched off. The complainant went to his house where his brother was present and told him that Anil was out somewhere and told him not to come again. On the basis of complaint, the FIR was registered. The accused was arrested on 1.5.2025. Since then he is in custody. Hence, present bail application.

**Anil Versus State of Haryana**

3. On notice, prosecution has filed the reply resisting the bail application.

4. It is contended by learned advocate for applicant/accused that applicant/accused is in custody since 1.5.2025. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He contended that the complainant himself is a banker so he could not have been induced by the applicant/accused. He argued that no money whatsoever was received by the accused. He prayed for granting bail to applicant/accused.

5. On the other hand, learned Public Prosecutor for State argued that applicant/accused has cheated the complainant of Rs.20 lac and got recovered only Rs.15,000/-. He argued that the entire amount was received by the accused in his account so there is no chance of false implication of the accused. If the applicant/accused is granted bail, he may hamper the investigation and arrest of co-accused and may also threaten the prosecution witnesses. He prayed for dismissing the bail application.

6. I have heard learned Public Prosecutor for the State and learned counsel for applicant/accused and have gone through the record very carefully.

7. The applicant/accused is alleged to have cheated the complainant of Rs.23 lac on the pretext of securing profit for him by cheap buying of gold pledged by the borrowers while taking loan. Rs.3 lac were paid to the complainant by the accused but the rest amount was not paid. The applicant/accused is stated to be in custody since the date of his arrest i.e. 1.5.2025. However, during investigation the accused had

**Anil Versus State of Haryana**

got recovered only Rs.15,000/- out of the dupe money Rs.20 lac. The final report has been presented but if the applicant/accused is granted bail he may threaten or influence the prosecution witnesses which are yet to be recorded.

9. Accordingly, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for granting the concession of bail to the applicant-accused. Therefore, without commenting on the merits of the case, lest it may prejudice the case of either of the parties during trial, the instant bail application filed by the applicant- accused **Anil**, is, hereby, **dismissed**.

File be consigned to the record room after due compliance.

Announced in open Court:  
16.7.2025.

(Sudhir Kumar)  
Stenographer Gr-II.

(Amberdeep Singh)  
Additional Sessions Judge,  
Panipat, UID No.HR00279.

(Amberdeep Singh)  
ASJ, Panipat, 16.7.2025

**Anil Versus State of Haryana**

**CNR No.HRPP01-006176-2025**

**BA-1621 of 2025**

**Anil Vs. State of Haryana**

Present: Shri Subhash Shelat, counsel for applicant/accused.  
Shri Baljit Singh, Public Prosecutor for the respondent/State.

Reply to bail application filed by State.

Arguments heard.

Vide separate order of even date of this Court, the present  
bail application of applicant/accused has been **dismissed**.

File be consigned to the records after due compliance.

Announced in open Court:

16.7.2025.

(Sudhir Kumar)  
Stenographer Gr-II.

(Amberdeep Singh)  
Additional Sessions Judge,  
Panipat, UID No.HR00279.

(Amberdeep Singh)  
ASJ, Panipat, 16.7.2025